

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

Applicant submitted a certified copy of the priority document on November 7, 2000. Confirmation of receipt of the priority document is respectfully requested in the next Office Action.

Claims 1-65 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 13 and 62 have been amended to address the alleged informalities therein, to address the Examiner's suggestion at page 6 of the Office Action, and as discussed in detail below. Claims 1-12, 14, 16-27, 31-62 and 64 have been amended for consistency, clarity of expression and conformance with U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 9-14, 18-20 and 62-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al. ("McPartlan") in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,541,911 to Nilakantan et al. ("Nilakantan") and U.S. Patent No. 6,212,511 to Fisher et al. ("Fisher"). Claims 3-8, 15-17, 21-61 and 63 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over McPartlan, Nilakantan and Fisher in further combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,212,529 to Boothby et al. ("Boothby").

Without acceding to the rejections, Claims 1, 13 and 62 have been amended to more particularly recite certain features of Applicant's invention. For example, Claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, transforming a first filter derived from a complex request from the manager of the application machine into a second simplified filter comprising only conditions on indexes, the second simplified filter corresponding to the following matching characteristics: the second simplified filter lets through all the SNMP requests whose responses could verify the first filter, based on conditions

whose attribute values could verify the first filter, and the second simplified filter filters out all the SNMP requests whose responses cannot in any way verify the first filter because the conditions on indexes associated with said filtered-out SNMP requests do not verify the first filter regardless of attribute values associated with said conditions, and in which the transforming further comprises deleting from the first filter all conditions that operate on attributes that are not associated with any of said indexes. Support is provided, for example, at page 9, lines 20-25 of Applicant's specification.

It is apparent that the applied references do not teach or suggest at least the above combination of features of Claim 1. For example, the Office Action acknowledges at page 3, line 19 to page 4, line 2 that McPartlan does not teach or suggest these features. The Office Action alleges that McPartlan's deficiencies in this regard can be cured by the teachings of Nilakantan.

However, the cited portion of Nilakantan merely teaches an SNMP agent that, based on a particular destination IP address designating a "Smart Filtering" request, "places all ones in the source IP address field, and sets the interface parameter to the first HSS port on the box." *See* Nilakantan, col. 19, lines 47-60. Neither McPartlan nor Nilakantan teaches or suggests transforming a first filter derived from a complex request from the manager of the application machine into a second simplified filter comprising only conditions on indexes, the second simplified filter corresponding to the following matching characteristics: the second simplified filter lets through all the SNMP requests whose responses could verify the first filter, based on conditions whose attribute values could verify the first filter, and the second simplified filter filters out all the SNMP requests whose responses cannot in any way verify the first

filter because the conditions on indexes associated with said filtered-out SNMP requests do not verify the first filter regardless of attribute values associated with said conditions, and in which the transforming further comprises deleting from the first filter all conditions that operate on attributes that are not associated with any of said indexes, as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 distinguishes patentably from McPartlan and Nilakantan, whether taken alone or in combination. The other secondary references apparently do not remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of McPartlan and Nilakantan.

Claims 13 has been amended to recited, *inter alia*, transforming a complex filter (F1) derived from the complex request addressed to agent (5) from the manager (4) of the application machine (2a) into a simplified filter (F2) comprising only conditions on indexes, the simplified filter (F2) adapted to let through all the SNMP requests whose responses could verify the complex filter (F1), based on conditions whose attribute values could verify the complex filter (F1), and to filter out all the SNMP requests whose responses cannot in any way verify the complex filter (F1) because the conditions on indexes associated with said filtered-out SNMP requests do not verify the first filter (F1) regardless of attribute values associated with said conditions, and in which the transforming further comprises deleting from the complex filter (F1) all conditions that operate on attributes that are not associated with any of said indexes.

Claim 62 has been amended to recited, *inter alia*, means for transforming a complex filter (F1) derived from the complex request addressed to agent (5) from the manager (4) of the application machine (2a) into a simplified filter (F2) comprising

only conditions on indexes, the simplified filter (F2) adapted to let through all the SNMP requests whose responses could verify the complex filter (F1), based on conditions whose attribute values could verify the complex filter (F1), and to filter out all the SNMP requests whose responses cannot in any way verify the complex filter (F1) because the conditions on indexes associated with said filtered-out SNMP requests do not verify the first filter (F1) regardless of attribute values associated with said conditions, and in which the transforming further comprises deleting from the complex filter (F1) all conditions that operate on attributes that are not associated with any of said indexes.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13 and 62 also distinguish patentably from the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

The remaining claims are also believed to be patentable due at least to the dependence from Claims 1, 13 and 62, as well as for the additional features recited in the remaining claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T3386-906538) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 18, 2007

By: 
Edward J. Kondracki
Reg. No. 20,604

Eric G. King
Reg. No. 42,736

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 903-9000
4838-9918-8737